REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Claims 1-44 were pending in this application and examined. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al. (U.S. Patent 6,101,503; hereinafter "Cooper").

Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 16, 28, 29, 30, and 42. Claims 1-44 remain pending in this application after entry of this amendment. Fig. 7 has been amended to correct typographical errors.

THE DRAWINGS

Typographical errors in Fig. 7 have been corrected. More specifically, an occurrence of text "Souce#1" in Fig. 7 has been changed to "Source #2" and another occurrence of "Source #1" has been changed to "Source #3". This is in line with the description provided in paragraph **[101]** in the specification.

Applicants have attached a Replacement Sheet including changes to Fig. 7. Applicants submit that no new subject matter has been introduced by the amendments to the figures. An Annotated Sheet is also attached showing the changes made to Fig. 7 in red.

THE CLAIMS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1

Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by Cooper for at least the reasons stated below.

(1) "identifying the first document displayed to the user" is not taught or suggested by Cooper

As described in the specification of the present invention, embodiments of the present invention provide techniques for providing relevant information to the user based upon documents accessed or view by the user. Further, the relevant information is provided

automatically to the user without requiring user input, i.e., the user does not have to enter any search query. (See specification: paragraph **[28]**). The document viewed by the user is itself used as a starting point for determining the relevant information. Accordingly, as part of providing relevant information to the user, the document displayed to the user is identified as recited in claim 1.

Applicants submit that this is not taught or suggested by Cooper. Cooper teaches techniques for finding documents that are relevant to a user-provided query. As described in Cooper in col. 4 lines 13-20, the user enters a query into the search engine. The user-entered query is then used to find a list of relevant documents which may then be displayed to the user. This is substantially different from the present invention recited in claim 1 where the document displayed to the user is identified and processed. Since the user provides the search query, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Cooper to identify the document displayed to the user as recited in Applicants' claim 1. In fact, Applicants submit that the system described in Cooper falls squarely within the prior art described in the background section of Applicants' specification and suffers from the same problems associated with prior art system (e.g., see paragraph **[13]** of the specification describing problems associated with the user having to enter an appropriate search query).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that this feature of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Cooper. Applicants thus submit that claim 1 is patentable over Cooper for at least this reason.

(2) "identifying at least a section of the first document" is not taught or suggested by Cooper

As recited above, a section of the document displayed to the user is identified and used to find the relevant information. As described in paragraph **[54]** of the specification, the identified section of the document may be the viewed portion of the document, the title section of the document, etc.

Applicants submit that this is not taught or suggested by Cooper. As previously indicated, in Cooper (col. 3 lines 12-26; col. 4 lines 13-28), the user enters a query which is then

used to find a list of relevant documents which may then be displayed to the user. Cooper does not teach identifying a section of the first document that is displayed to the user. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this feature of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Cooper. Applicants thus submit that claim 1 is patentable over Cooper.

(3) "extracting a first set of information objects . . ." is not taught or suggested by Cooper

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> extracting a first set of information objects from the first section of the first document, the first set of information objects comprising at least a first information object comprising information of a first type and a second information object comprising information of a second type, wherein the first type is different from the second type; (Applicants' claim 1, emphasis added)

As recited above, information objects are extracted from the first section of the first document. As described in the specification in paragraph **[55]**, an information object is an entity (e.g., a data structure, an object, etc.) which stores information of a particular type. The types of information may include text, audio, video, images, etc. For example, an audio object stores audio information, a video object stores video information, a text object stores text information, etc. Accordingly, the extracted information objects may include objects comprising information of different types. Claim 1 has been amended to further emphasize this aspect of the present invention. Claim 1, as amended, recites that the set of extracted information objects comprise at least a first information object comprising information of a first type and a second information object comprising information of a second type, wherein the first type is different from the second type.

Applicants submit that the concept of extracting objects comprising information of different types is not taught or suggested by Cooper. The sections of Cooper identified by the Office Action (Cooper: Fig 2 and 4, col. 3 lines 17-18) describe determining a list of documents matching a user-specified query. A markup engine then selects words in one or more of the selected documents and inserts codes or markers around the selected words. Applicants submit that this is substantially different from extracting information objects from a section of the

document displayed to the user. In Cooper, information objects are not extracted from a section of the document displayed to the user. Inserting codes or markers around words is not the same as extracting information objects as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Further, as recited in claim 1, the extracted information objects comprise at least a first information object comprising information of a first type and a second information object comprising information of a second type, wherein the first type is different from the second type. For example, the first information object may comprise audio information and the second information object may comprise video information. Accordingly, the set of extracted information objects comprises objects storing information of different types. Applicants submit that this is clearly not taught or suggested by Cooper. As stated above, Cooper teaches finding words in documents and inserting markers around the selected words. This is substantially different from extracting objects storing information of different types from a document displayed to the user, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants thus submit that claim 1 is patentable over Cooper for at least this reason.

(4) "determining degree of relevancy information . . . " is not taught or suggested by Cooper

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> determining degree of relevancy information for a second set of information objects, the degree of relevancy information indicating the relevancy of information objects in the second set of information objects to information objects in the first set of information objects;
> (Applicants' claim 1, emphasis added)

As recited above, degree of relevancy information is determined for information objects in the second set of information objects. The degree of relevancy information indicates the relevancy of information objects in the second set of information objects to information objects in the first set of information objects. Accordingly, as recited in claim 1, the degree of relevancy information is determined between objects (where one set of objects is extracted from the document displayed to the user) -- not between documents.

Applicants submit that this concept not taught or suggested by Cooper. The Office Action acknowledges that Cooper does not explicitly disclose determining a degree of relevancy. (See Office Action: pg. 3, 1st paragraph). However, the Examiner contends that this feature would have been obvious in light of Cooper. Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

Firstly, Applicants would like to emphasize that in claim 1, the degree of relevancy information is determined between a second set of objects and objects extracted from the section of the document displayed to the user -- not between documents. In Cooper, on the other hand, the search system receives a user-specified query and looks up and ranks the relevance of a list of documents to the search query (Cooper: col. 4 lines 13-18). There is no teaching or suggestion in Cooper to determine relevancy between a second set of information objects and a first set of information objects extracted from a document displayed to the user. The ranking system in Cooper may potentially be used to rank documents according to their relevancy, as contended in the Office Action, but this is not related in any conceivable manner to determining relevancy between sets of objects (where one set of information objects are extracted from a section of a document displayed to the user).

Applicants thus submit that this feature of claim 1 is also not taught or suggested by Cooper.

(5) "selecting a third set of information objects . . ." is not taught or suggested by Cooper

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> selecting a third set of information objects from information objects in the second set of information objects based upon the degree of relevancy information determined for information objects in the second set of information objects, wherein information objects in the third set of information objects store information to be output to the user when the first document is being displayed to the user. (Applicants' claim 1, emphasis added)

As recited above, a third set of information objects is selected from information objects in the second set of information objects based upon the degree of relevancy information determined for the information objects in the second set of information objects. As described

above, Cooper fails to teach or suggest determining relevancy information for a set of objects (as contrasted with a set of documents). Accordingly, Applicants submit that selecting a third set of information objects based upon the degree of relevancy information determined for the information objects in the second set of information objects is also not taught or suggested by Cooper.

Applicants thus submit that this feature of claim 1 is also not taught or suggested by Cooper.

In light of the above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Cooper for at least reasons (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) stated above, and others.

Claims 2-13, 15-27, and 29-41

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 15 and 29 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for allowing claim 1, and others. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2-13, 16-27, and 30-41 which depend from claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claims 1, 15, and 29, and others.

Applicants further submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited references considered individually or in combination. For example, dependent claims 2, 16, and 30 recite that the "first section of the first document corresponds to a section of the first document displayed to the user, wherein the section of the first document displayed to the user is less than the entire first document." Accordingly, the first set of information objects are extracted only from a portion of the first document that is actually displayed to the user. For example, a long first document may be displayed to the user via a browser. In this scenario, as recited in claims 2, 16, and 30, the first section of the first document corresponds to the section of the first document that is presently displayed by the browser and does not include sections of the first document that are not displayed to the user. As the user scrolls through the first document, the first section of the document may change corresponding to the displayed section of the document. The first set of information objects that are extracted depend upon the portion of the document displayed to the user and may change as different

portions of the document are displayed to the user. Applicants submit that such as concept is not taught or suggested by Cooper. There is no teaching or suggestion in Cooper of identifying a section of a document that is displayed to the user, where the displayed section is less than the entire document, extracting a first set of information objects from the displayed section, and using the extracted objects for subsequent processing. Applicants thus respectfully submit that this is another reason for the patentability of claims 2, 16, and 30.

Claims 14, 28, and 42-44

Applicants submit that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for allowing claim 1.

In addition, claim 14 recites "identifying a plurality of selection techniques for determining degree of relevancy information for the first set of CPIOs". As described in the specification (See: for example, paragraphs **[65]** and **[66]**), different selection techniques may be used to select CPIOs. Applicants submit that this feature of claim 14 is not taught or suggested by Cooper. The Office Action fails to identify how this feature of claim 14 is anticipated or suggested by Cooper. There is no teaching or suggestion in Cooper of using different selection techniques for selecting objects. Applicants thus submit that this is yet another reason for allowing claim 14.

Applicants further submit that independent claims 28 and 42 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for allowing claim 14, and others. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 43 and 44, which depend from claim 42, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for allowing claim 42, and others.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

S. B. Kotwal

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:km

60231310 v1